

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

|                  | r              |                      |                     |                  |  |
|------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
| 10/752,932       | 01/06/2004     | Setsuhiro Saheki     | 2933PI-6            | 5787             |  |
| 22442 75         | 590 06/08/2006 |                      | EXAM                | EXAMINER         |  |
| SHERIDAN ROSS PC |                |                      | RIVELL, JOHN A      |                  |  |
| 1560 BROADV      | VAY            |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| SUITE 1200       |                |                      | ARTONII             | FAFER NOMBER     |  |
| DENVER, CO       | 80202          |                      | 3753                |                  |  |

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)      |  |  |  |  |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
|  | 10/752,932        | SAHEKI, SETSUHIRO |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner          | Art Unit          |  |  |  |  |
|  | John Rivell       | 3753              |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply   |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/6/0   | 14 (application). |                   |  |  |  |  |
|  |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is   |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| 4)  Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.   |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 January 2004</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.   |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>  |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01062004, 06142004.  U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)  Office Ac  | 6) Other:         |                   |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/752,932

Art Unit: 3753

Claims 1-14 are pending.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winger in view of Raymond.

The patent to Winger discloses, in figure 1 for example, a "gas filling device for filling plurality of tires with gas, the gas filling device comprising: a gas supply source (air tank 17);... and a plurality of gas chucks (at the ends of respective inflation lines 15, 16), wherein each gas chuck is connected to one of the... tire(s), wherein each gas chuck permits gas to be supplied to the connected tire so that the pressure of the tire becomes the target pressure set by the... pressure regulator" at common reducer 59.

Thus the patent to Winger discloses all the claimed features with the exception of having "a plurality of pressure regulators connected to the gas supply source, wherein each pressure regulator sets the pressure of gas supplied from the gas supply source to a predetermined target pressure" in each gas supply line.

The patent to Raymond discloses that it is known in the art to employ a plurality of pressure regulators 34, each regulator plumbed in individual air supply line at 42 for the purpose of supplying air pressure to individual use points of varying pressure as set by the individual pressure regulators.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Winger individual pressure regulators plumbed in each supply line 15, 16 for the purpose of supplying air pressure to

Art Unit: 3753

individual tires of varying pressure as set by the individual pressure regulators as recognized by Raymond.

Regarding claim 2, in Winger, "each gas chuck (at the end of individual lines 15, 16) has a fitting portion (e.g. a clip on type chuck) that is fitted to a tire valve located on the corresponding tire" as recited.

Regarding claim 4, in Winger, "the fitting portion of each (clip type) gas chuck has a cylindrical receiving portion to receive a tire valve" as recited.

Regarding claim 7, the device of the combination includes "a plurality of tube bodies (at supply lines 15, 16 of Winger), wherein the tube bodies extend from the gas supply source (air tank 17 of Winger) and permit gas to pass through, wherein each pressure regulator (as taught by Raymond) is located in one of the tube bodies, and wherein each gas chuck (at the end of supply lines 15, 16 of Winger) is provided at a distal end of one of the tub [sic] bodies" as recited.

Regarding claim 8, the patent to Winger discloses all the claimed features, as noted above, but lacks having "a plurality of pressure regulators connected to the gas supply source, wherein each pressure regulator sets the pressure of gas supplied from the gas supply source to a predetermined target pressure" in each gas supply line.

The patent to Raymond discloses that it is known in the art to employ a plurality of pressure regulators 34, each regulator plumbed in individual air supply line at 42 for the purpose of supplying air pressure to individual use points of varying pressure as set by the individual pressure regulators.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Winger individual pressure regulators plumbed in each supply line 15, 16 for the purpose of supplying air pressure to

Application/Control Number: 10/752,932

Art Unit: 3753

individual tires of varying pressure as set by the individual pressure regulators as recognized by Raymond.

Regarding claim 9, in Winger, "each (clip type) air chuck has a fitting portion that is fitted to a tire valve located on the corresponding tire" as recited.

Regarding claim 14, in the combination, "a plurality of tube bodies (at 15, 16 of Winger),... extend from the air compressor and permit air to pass through, wherein each pressure regulator (as taught by Raymond) is located in one of the tube bodies, and wherein each air chuck is provided at a distal end of one of the tub [sic] bodies" as recited.

Claims 3, 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winger in view of Raymond as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 14 above, further in view of Will.

The patent to Winger, as modified by Raymond, discloses all the claimed features with the exception of having "the fitting portions of (any) of the (clip type) gas chucks have different forms or sizes such that the fitting portions can be fitted to different kinds of tire valves".

The patent to Will discloses that it is known in the art to employ an inflation chuck, generally at 10, in which the supply outlet at 26, 28 connected to the inflated device, includes seal rings 30, 32 of different diameter for the purpose of accommodating different size valve stems as evinced by "SCHRADER" and "PRESTA" type valve stems being accommodated thereby.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Winger, as modified by Raymond, rings of different diameter in the clip type inflation chucks of Winger for the purpose of accommodating different size valve stems as recognized by Will.

Claims 6, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winger in view of Raymond as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 14 above, further in view of Kirkpatrick.

The patent to Winger, as modified by Raymond, discloses all the claimed features with the exception of having "a sealing member is located in the cylindrical receiving portion of each gas chuck, wherein, when the fitting portion is fitted to a tire valve, the sealing member seals between the tire valve and the fitting portion".

The patent to Kirkpatrick discloses that it is known in the art to employ a "seal" element at seal J, accommodated within a cylindrical receiving portion of a clip type inflation chuck for the purpose of sealing the connection between the cylindrical portion and the inserted inflation stem.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Winger, as modified by Raymond, a seal element in the clip type inflation chuck of Winger, for the purpose of sealing the connection between the cylindrical portion and the inserted inflation stem as recognized by Kirkpatrick.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winger in view of Raymond and Kirkpatrick as applied to claims 6, 11 and 13 above, further in view of Will as applied to claims 3, 5 and 10 above.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Rivell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4918. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur. from 6:30am-5:00pm (EST).

Application/Control Number: 10/752,932 Page 6

Art Unit: 3753

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Keasel can be reached on (571) 272-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753